arXiv:quant-ph/0406233v4 10 Feb 2006

A Path Integral Approach for Disordered Quantum Walks in One Dimension

Norio Konno
Department of Applied Mathematics
Yokohama National University
Hodogaya-ku, Yokohama 240-8501, Japan
norio@mathlab.sci.ynu.ac.jp

Abstract. The present letter gives a rigorous way from quantum to classical random walks by introducing an independent random fluctuation and then taking expectations based on a path integral approach.

1 Introduction

Recently the quantum walk (QW) is receiving significant attention, because it is a natural generalization of classical random walks to quantum systems, and because QWs could be useful in constructing efficient quantum algorithms. Here we focus on discrete-time QWs on the integers. QWs behave quite differently from classical walks. For the classical walk, the probability distribution is a binomial distribution with a variance that grows linearly with time. The probability distribution in a QW, by contrast, has a complicated and oscillatory form with a variance that grows quadratically with time. For recent comprehensive reviews, see Kempe [1], Tregenna *et al.* [2], Ambainis [3].

A unitary matrix corresponding to the evolution of the QW is usually deterministic and independent of the time step. In this letter we study a random unitary matrix case motivated by numerical results of Ribeiro *et al.* [4] and Mackay *et al.* [5]. We obtain a classical random walk from the QW by introducing an independent random fluctuation at each time step and performing an ensemble average in a rigorous way based on a path integral approach. The time evolution of the QW is given by the following infinite random unitary matrices $\{U_n : n = 1, 2, \ldots\}$:

$$U_n = \begin{bmatrix} a_n & b_n \\ c_n & d_n \end{bmatrix},$$

PACS numbers: 03.67.Lx, 05.40.Fb
Key words. Quantum walks; Path integral; Qunatum algorithms; Classical random walks.

where $a_n, b_n, c_n, d_n \in \mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{C}$ is a set of complex numbers. The subscript n indicates the time step. The unitarity of U_n gives

$$|a_n|^2 + |c_n|^2 = |b_n|^2 + |d_n|^2 = 1,\ a_n\overline{c_n} + b_n\overline{d_n} = 0,\ c_n = -\triangle_n\overline{b_n},\ d_n = \triangle_n\overline{a_n}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\overline{z}$ is the complex conjugate of $z \in \mathbf{C}$ and $\triangle_n = \det U_n = a_n d_n - b_n c_n$ with $|\triangle_n| = 1$. Put $w_n = (a_n, b_n, c_n, d_n)$. Let $\{w_n : n = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ be independent and identically distributed (or i.i.d. for short) on some space, (for example, $[0, 2\pi)$) with

$$E(|a_1|^2) = E(|b_1|^2) = 1/2, \tag{1.2}$$

$$E(a_1\overline{c_1}) = 0. \tag{1.3}$$

Remark that Eq.(1.2) implies $E(|c_1|^2) = E(|d_1|^2) = 1/2$, and Eq.(1.3) gives $E(b_1\overline{d_1}) = 0$ by using Eq.(1.1). The set of initial qubit states for the QW is given by

$$\Phi = \left\{\varphi = {}^t[\alpha, \beta] \in \mathbf{C}^2 : |\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1\right\},$$

where t means the transposed operator. Moreover we assume that $\{w_n : n = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ and $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ are independent. We call the above process *disordered QW* in this letter. Let $\mathbf{R}$ be the set of real numbers. Then we consider the following two cases:

Case I: $a_n, b_n, c_n, d_n \in \mathbf{R}$ $(n = 1, 2, \ldots)$ and $E(\alpha\overline{\beta} + \overline{\alpha}\beta) = 0$.

Case II: $E(|\alpha|^2) = 1/2$ and $E(\alpha\overline{\beta}) = 0$.

We should note that Case I corresponds to an example given by Ribeiro *et al.* [4] and Case II corresponds to an example given by Mackay *et al.* [5], respectively. The numerical simulations by these two groups suggest that the probability distribution of the disordered QW converges to a binomial distribution by averaging over many trials. So the main purpose of the letter is to prove the above numerical results by using a path integral approach, which has been used in [6, 7, 8], for example. In fact, our theorem (see Theorem 1) shows that the expectation of the probability distribution for the disordered QW becomes the probability distribution of a classical symmetric random walk. However our result does not treat a crossover from quantum to classical walks. Concerning the crossover, see [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15], for specific examples.

The rest of the letter is organized as follows. Section 2 gives the definition of the disordered QW. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1. Section 4 is devoted to examples given by [4, 5, 15].

2 Definition of Disordered QW

First we divide U_n into two matrices:

$$P_n = \begin{bmatrix} a_n & b_n \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Q_n = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ c_n & d_n \end{bmatrix}$$

with $U_n = P_n + Q_n$. The important point is that P_n (resp. Q_n) represents that the particle moves to the left (resp. right) at each time step n. By using P_n and Q_n, we define the

dynamics of the disordered QW on the line. To do so, we define the $(4N+2)\times(4N+2)$ matrix $\overline{U}_n$ by

$$\overline{U}_n = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & P_n & 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 & Q_n \\ Q_n & 0 & P_n & 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & Q_n & 0 & P_n & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & Q_n & 0 & P_n & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 & Q_n & 0 & P_n \\ P_n & 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 & Q_n & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $0 = O_2$ is the 2×2 zero matrix. Note that P_n and Q_n satisfy

$$P_nP_n^* + Q_nQ_n^* = P_n^*P_n + Q_n^*Q_n = I_2, \quad P_nQ_n^* = Q_nP_n^* = Q_n^*P_n = P_n^*Q_n = O_2,$$

where $*$ means the adjoint operator and I_2 is the 2×2 unit matrix. The above relations imply that $\overline{U}_n$ becomes also a unitary matrix. Let

$$\Psi_k^{(n)}(\varphi) = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{L,k}^{(n)}(\varphi) \\ \Psi_{R,k}^{(n)}(\varphi) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbf{C}^2$$

be a two component vector of amplitudes of the particle being at site k and at time n with the chirality being left (upper component) and right (lower component), and let

$$\Psi^{(n)}(\varphi) = {}^t[\Psi_{-N}^{(n)}(\varphi), \Psi_{-(N-1)}^{(n)}(\varphi), \dots, \Psi_N^{(n)}(\varphi)]$$

be the state at time n. An initial state for the system is given by

$$\Psi^{(0)}(\varphi) = {}^t[\overbrace{0,\dots,0}^{N}, \varphi, \overbrace{0,\dots,0}^{N}] \in \mathbf{C}^{2N+1},$$

where $0 = {}^t[0,0]$ and $\varphi = {}^t[\alpha,\beta]$. The following equation defines the time evolution of the disordered QW: for $-N \le k \le N$ and $1 \le n < N$,

$$(\Psi^{(n)}(\varphi))_k = (\overline{U}_n\Psi^{(n-1)}(\varphi))_k = Q_n\Psi_{k-1}^{(n-1)}(\varphi) + P_n\Psi_{k+1}^{(n-1)}(\varphi),$$

For an initial state $\overline{\varphi} = {}^t[\overbrace{0,\dots,0}^{N}, \varphi, \overbrace{0,\dots,0}^{N}]$, we have

$$\overline{U}_1\overline{\varphi} = {}^t[\overbrace{0,\dots,0}^{N-1}, P_1\varphi, 0, Q_1\varphi, \overbrace{0,\dots,0}^{N-1}],$$
$$\overline{U}_2\overline{U}_1\overline{\varphi} = {}^t[\overbrace{0,\dots,0}^{N-2}, P_2P_1\varphi, 0, (P_2Q_1+Q_2P_1)\varphi, 0, Q_2Q_1\varphi, \overbrace{0,\dots,0}^{N-2}].$$

Let X_n^φ denote the disordered QW at time n starting from $\varphi \in \Phi$. By using $\Psi_k^{(n)}(\varphi)$, the probability of $\{X_n^\varphi = k\}$ is defined by

$$P(X_n^\varphi = k) = \|\Psi_k^{(n)}(\varphi)\|^2 = |\Psi_{L,k}^{(n)}(\varphi)|^2 + |\Psi_{R,k}^{(n)}(\varphi)|^2.$$

Remark that $\{X_n^\varphi = k\}$ is an event generated by $\{w_i : i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and $\{\alpha, \beta\}$. The unitarity of $\overline{U}_m (m = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$ ensures

$$\sum_{k=-n}^{n} P(X_n^\varphi = k) = \|\overline{U}_n \overline{U}_{n-1} \cdots \overline{U}_1 \overline{\varphi}\|^2 = \|\overline{\varphi}\|^2 = |\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1,$$

for any $1 \leq n \leq N$. That is, the amplitude always defines a probability distribution for the location.

3 Main Result

We now give a combinatorial expression of the probability distribution of the disordered QW. For fixed l and m with $l + m = n$ and $-l + m = k$, we introduce

$$\Xi_n(l, m) = \sum_{l_j, m_j \geq 0 : l_1 + \cdots + l_n = l, m_1 + \cdots + m_n = m} P^{l_n} Q^{m_n} P^{l_{n-1}} Q^{m_{n-1}} \cdots P^{l_1} Q^{m_1}.$$

We should note that

$$\Psi_k^{(n)}(\varphi) = \Xi_n(l, m)\varphi.$$

For example, in the case of $P(X_4^\varphi = 0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_4(2, 2) &= P_4 Q_3 Q_2 P_1 + Q_4 P_3 P_2 Q_1 \\ &\quad + P_4 P_3 Q_2 Q_1 + P_4 Q_3 P_2 Q_1 + Q_4 P_3 Q_2 P_1 + Q_4 Q_3 P_2 P_1. \end{aligned}$$

Here we introduce the useful random matrices to compute $\Xi_n(l, m)$:

$$R_n = \begin{bmatrix} c_n & d_n \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad S_n = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ a_n & b_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

In general, we obtain the following table of products of the matrices P_j, Q_j, R_j and S_j $(j = 1, 2, \ldots)$: for any $m, n \geq 1$,

	P_n	Q_n	R_n	S_n
P_m	$a_m P_n$	$b_m R_n$	$a_m R_n$	$b_m P_n$
Q_m	$c_m S_n$	$d_m Q_n$	$c_m Q_n$	$d_m S_n$
R_m	$c_m P_n$	$d_m R_n$	$c_m R_n$	$d_m P_n$
S_m	$a_m S_n$	$b_m Q_n$	$a_m Q_n$	$b_m S_n$

where $P_m Q_n = b_m R_n$, for example. From this table, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_4(2, 2) &= b_4 d_3 c_2 P_1 + c_4 a_3 b_2 Q_1 \\ &\quad + (a_4 b_3 d_2 + b_4 c_3 b_2) R_1 + (c_4 b_3 c_2 + d_4 c_3 a_2) S_1. \end{aligned}$$

We should note that P_1, Q_1, R_1 and S_1 form an orthonormal basis of the vector space of complex 2×2 matrices with respect to the trace inner product $\langle A|B\rangle = \mathrm{tr}(A^* B)$. So $\Xi_n(l, m)$ has the following form:

$$\Xi_n(l, m) = p_n(l, m) P_1 + q_n(l, m) Q_1 + r_n(l, m) R_1 + s_n(l, m) S_1. \tag{3.1}$$

In general, explicit forms of $p_n(l,m), q_n(l,m), r_n(l,m)$ and $s_n(l,m)$ are complicated. From Eq. (3.1), we have

$$\Xi_n(l,m) = \begin{bmatrix} p_n(l,m)a_1 + r_n(l,m)c_1 & p_n(l,m)b_1 + r_n(l,m)d_1 \\ q_n(l,m)c_1 + s_n(l,m)a_1 & q_n(l,m)d_1 + s_n(l,m)b_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Remark that $p_n(l,m), q_n(l,m), r_n(l,m), s_n(l,m)$ depend only on $\{w_i : i = 2, 3, \ldots n\}$, so they are independent of w_1, where $w_i = (a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i)$. Moreover it should be noted that $\{w_i : i = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ and $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ are independent. Therefore we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P(X_n^{\varphi} = k) &= ||\Xi_n(l,m)\varphi||^2 \\ &= \left\{|p_n(l,m)a_1 + r_n(l,m)c_1|^2 + |q_n(l,m)c_1 + s_n(l,m)a_1|^2\right\}|\alpha|^2 \\ &\quad + \left\{|p_n(l,m)b_1 + r_n(l,m)d_1|^2 + |q_n(l,m)d_1 + s_n(l,m)b_1|^2\right\}|\beta|^2 \\ &\quad + \Big\{\overline{(p_n(l,m)a_1 + r_n(l,m)c_1)}(p_n(l,m)b_1 + r_n(l,m)d_1) \\ &\quad + \overline{(q_n(l,m)c_1 + s_n(l,m)a_1)}(q_n(l,m)d_1 + s_n(l,m)b_1)\Big\}\overline{\alpha}\beta \\ &\quad + \Big\{(p_n(l,m)a_1 + r_n(l,m)c_1)\overline{(p_n(l,m)b_1 + r_n(l,m)d_1)} \\ &\quad + (q_n(l,m)c_1 + s_n(l,m)a_1)\overline{(q_n(l,m)d_1 + s_n(l,m)b_1)}\Big\}\alpha\overline{\beta} \\ &= C_1|\alpha|^2 + C_2|\beta|^2 + C_3\overline{\alpha}\beta + C_4\alpha\overline{\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we see that

$$E(C_1|\alpha|^2) = \frac{1}{2}E[|p_n(l,m)|^2 + |s_n(l,m)|^2 + |q_n(l,m)|^2 + |r_n(l,m)|^2]E(|\alpha|^2),$$

since $\{p_n(l,m), q_n(l,m), r_n(l,m), s_n(l,m)\}$ and w_1 are independent, $\{w_i : i = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ and $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ are independent, Eqs.(1.2) and (1.3). Similarly, we have

$$E(C_2|\beta|^2) = \frac{1}{2}E[|p_n(l,m)|^2 + |s_n(l,m)|^2 + |q_n(l,m)|^2 + |r_n(l,m)|^2]E(|\beta|^2).$$

Case I: First we note that $C_4 = \overline{C_3}$. So $a_n, b_n, c_n, d_n \in \mathbf{R}$ gives $C_3 = C_4$. Then the condition $\alpha\overline{\beta} + \overline{\alpha}\beta = 0$ implies $C_3\overline{\alpha}\beta + C_4\alpha\overline{\beta} = 0$. Therefore we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &E(P(X_n^{\varphi} = k)) \\ &= E(||\Xi_n(l,m)\varphi||^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}E[|p_n(l,m)|^2 + |s_n(l,m)|^2 + |q_n(l,m)|^2 + |r_n(l,m)|^2]\, E(|\alpha|^2) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}E[|p_n(l,m)|^2 + |s_n(l,m)|^2 + |q_n(l,m)|^2 + |r_n(l,m)|^2]\, E(|\beta|^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left\{E(|p_n(l,m)|^2) + E(|q_n(l,m)|^2) + E(|r_n(l,m)|^2) + E(|s_n(l,m)|^2)\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

since $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$.
Case II: $E(\alpha\overline{\beta}) = E(\overline{\alpha}\beta) = 0$ gives the above same conclusion in a similar fashion.

To get a feel for the following main result, we will look at a concrete case of $n = 4$ with $l = m = 2$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& E(P(X_4^{\varphi} = 0)) \\
= \; & E(||\Xi_4(2,2)\varphi||^2) \\
= \; & \frac{1}{2}\Big\{E(|p_4(2,2)|^2) + E(|q_4(2,2)|^2) + E(|r_4(2,2)|^2) + E(|s_4(2,2)|^2)\Big\} \\
= \; & \frac{1}{2}\Big\{E(|b_4|^2)E(|d_3|^2)E(|c_2|^2) + E(|c_4|^2)E(|a_3|^2)E(|b_2|^2) \\
& + E(|a_4|^2)E(|b_3|^2)E(|d_2|^2) + E(|b_4|^2)E(|c_3|^2)E(|b_2|^2) \\
& + E(a_4\overline{b_4})E(b_3\overline{c_3})E(d_2\overline{b_2}) + E(\overline{a_4}b_4)E(\overline{b_3}c_3)E(\overline{d_2}b_2) \\
& + E(|c_4|^2)E(|b_3|^2)E(|c_2|^2) + E(|d_4|^2)E(|c_3|^2)E(|a_2|^2) \\
& + E(c_4\overline{d_4})E(b_3\overline{c_3})E(c_2\overline{a_2}) + E(\overline{c_4}d_4)E(\overline{b_3}c_3)E(\overline{c_2}a_2)\Big\} \\
= \; & \frac{1}{16} + \frac{1}{16} + \frac{2}{16} + \frac{2}{16} = \frac{1}{2^4}\binom{4}{2},
\end{aligned}$$

since $E(|a_1|^2) = E(|b_1|^2) = E(|c_1|^2) = E(|d_1|^2) = 1/2$, and $E(a_1\overline{c_1}) = E(b_1\overline{d_1}) = 0$. This result corresponds to $P(Y_4^o = 0) = \binom{4}{2}/2^4$, where Y_n^o denotes the classical symmetric random walk starting from the origin. We generalize the above example as follows:

THEOREM 1 *We assume that a disordered QW starting from φ satisfies Case I or Case II. For $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots,$ and $k = -n, -(n-1), \ldots, n-1, n,$ with $n + k$ is even, we have*

$$E(P(X_n^{\varphi} = k)) = P(Y_n^o = k) = \frac{1}{2^n}\binom{n}{(n+k)/2}$$

Proof. For $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots,$ and $k = -n, -(n-1), \ldots, n-1, n,$ with $n + k$ is even, let $l = (n-k)/2$, $m = (n+k)/2$ and $M = \binom{n}{(n+k)/2}$. In general, as in the case of $n = 4$ with $l = m = 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P(X_n^{\varphi} = k) &= E(||\Xi_n(l,m)\varphi||^2) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{M} E(|u_n^{(j)}|^2)E(|u_{n-1}^{(j)}|^2)\cdots E(|u_2^{(j)}|^2) + E(R(w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n)),
\end{aligned}$$

where $u_i^{(j)} \in \{a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i\}$ for any $i = 2, 3, \ldots, n$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, M$ and $w_k = (a_k, b_k, c_k, d_k)$ for any $k = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. Then $E(|a_1|^2) = E(|b_1|^2) = E(|c_1|^2) = E(|d_1|^2) = 1/2$ gives

$$E(P(X_n^{\varphi} = k)) = \frac{M}{2^n} + E(R(w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n)).$$

To get the desired conclusion, it suffices to show that $E(R(w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n)) = 0$. When there are more than two terms in $p_n(l,m)$ or $s_n(l,m)$, we have to consider two cases: there is a k such that

$$\cdots P_{k+1}P_kP_{k-1}\cdots P_1, \qquad \cdots Q_{k+1}P_kP_{k-1}\cdots P_1,$$

For example, $s_4(2,2) = d_4c_3a_2 + c_4b_3c_2$ case is $k = 1$, since

$$Q_4Q_3P_2P_1, \qquad Q_4P_3Q_2P_1.$$

Then the corresponding $p_n(l,m)$ or $s_n(l,m)$ are given by

$$\cdots a_{k+1}a_ka_{k-1}\cdots a_2, \qquad \cdots c_{k+1}a_ka_{k-1}\cdots a_2.$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E\left[\overline{(\cdots a_{k+1}a_ka_{k-1}\cdots a_2)}(\cdots c_{k+1}a_ka_{k-1}\cdots a_2)\right] \\ = \;& E(\cdots)\, E(\overline{a_{k+1}}c_{k+1})\, E(|a_k|^2)\, E(|a_{k-1}|^2)\cdots E(|a_2|^2) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

since $E(\overline{a_1}c_1) = 0$. In other cases, a similar argument holds. So the proof is complete.

The above theorem implies that the expectation of the probability distribution for the disordered QW is nothing but the probability distribution of classical symmetric random walk.

4 Examples

The first example was introduced and studied by Ribeiro *et al.* [4]. This corresponds to Case I:

$$U_n = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\theta_n) & \sin(\theta_n) \\ \sin(\theta_n) & -\cos(\theta_n) \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\{\theta_n : n = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ are i.i.d. on $[0, 2\pi)$ with

$$E(\cos^2(\theta_1)) = E(\sin^2(\theta_1)) = 1/2, \quad E(\cos(\theta_1)\sin(\theta_1)) = 0.$$

Here we give two concrete cases:

(i) θ_1 is the uniform distribution on $[0, 2\pi)$,

(ii) $P(\theta_1 = \xi) = P(\theta_1 = \pi/2 + \xi) = 1/2$ for some $\xi \in [0, \pi)$.

For an initial qubit state, we choose a non-random $\varphi = {}^t[\alpha, \beta] \in \Psi$ with $|\alpha| = |\beta| = 1/\sqrt{2}$, and $\alpha\overline{\beta} + \overline{\alpha}\beta = 0$.

The second example was given by Mackay *et al.* [5]. This corresponds to Case II:

$$U_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & e^{i\theta_n} \\ e^{-i\theta_n} & -1 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\{\theta_n : n = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ are i.i.d. on $[0, 2\pi)$ with

$$E(\cos(\theta_1)) = E(\sin(\theta_1)) = 0.$$

Moreover an initial qubit state is chosen as $\varphi = {}^t[\alpha, \beta] \in \Psi$ with $E(|\alpha|^2) = 1/2$ and $E(\alpha\overline{\beta}) = 0$. For example, both θ_1 and θ_* are uniform distributions on $[0, 2\pi)$, and they are independent each other. Let $\alpha = \cos(\theta_*)$ and $\beta = \cos(\theta_*)$. So the above conditions hold.

Finally we discuss an example studied by Shapira *et al.* [15]. Let $W_n = \{X_n, Y_n, Z_n\}$, where $\{W_n : n = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ is i.i.d., and $\{X_n, Y_n, Z_n\}$ is also i.i.d., moreover X_n is the normal distribution with the mean 0 and the variance σ^2 with $\sigma > 0$. Their case is

$$U_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \times V_n,$$

where

$$V_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \cos(R_n) + iZ_n \frac{\sin(R_n)}{R_n} & (Y_n + iX_n)\frac{\sin(R_n)}{R_n} \\ (-Y_n + iX_n)\frac{\sin(R_n)}{R_n} & \cos(R_n) - iZ_n \frac{\sin(R_n)}{R_n} \end{bmatrix},$$

and $R_n = \sqrt{X_n^2 + Y_n^2 + Z_n^2}$. Then a direct computation implies

$$\begin{aligned} E(|a_1|^2) &= E(|b_1|^2) = 1/2, \\ E(a_1\overline{c_1}) &= \frac{1}{6} + \frac{1}{3}(1 - 4\sigma^2)e^{-2\sigma^2} \equiv \mu(\sigma). \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

We see that Eq. (4.1) implies $0 < \mu(\sqrt{3}/2) = 0.0179\ldots \leq \mu(\sigma) \leq 1/2 (= \lim_{\sigma \downarrow 0} \mu(\sigma))$ for any $\sigma > 0$. Note that the limit $\sigma \downarrow 0$ corresponds to the Hadamard walk case. So their example does not satisfy our condition Eq. (1.3).

References

[1] J. Kempe, *Quantum random walks - an introductory overview*, *Contemporary Physics* **44** (2003) 307–327.

[2] B. Tregenna, W. Flanagan, W. Maile and V. Kendon, *Controlling discrete quantum walks: coins and initial states*, *New Journal of Physics* **5** (2003) 83.

[3] A. Ambainis, *Quantum walks and their algorithmic applications*, *International Journal of Quantum Information* **1** (2003) 507–518.

[4] P. Ribeiro, P. Milman and R. Mosseri, *Aperiodic quantum random walks* (2004) quant-ph/0406071.

[5] T. D. Mackay, S. D. Bartlett, L. T. Stephanson and B. C. Sanders, *Quantum walks in higher dimensions*, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **35** (2002) 2745–2753.

[6] N. Konno, T. Namiki and T. Soshi, *Symmetry of distribution for the one-dimensional Hadamard walk*, *Interdisciplinary Information Sciences* **10** (2004) 11–22.

[7] N. Konno, *Quantum random walks in one dimension*, *Quantum Information Processing* **1** (2002) 345–354.

[8] N. Konno, *A new type of limit theorems for the one-dimensional quantum random walk*, (2002) quant-ph/0206103.

[9] T. A. Brun, H. A. Carteret and A. Ambainis, *Quantum to classical transition for random walks*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91** (2003) 130602.

[10] T. A. Brun, H. A. Carteret and A. Ambainis, *Quantum walks driven by many coins*, *Phys. Rev. A* **67** (2003) 052317.

[11] T. A. Brun, H. A. Carteret and A. Ambainis, *Quantum random walks with decoherent coins*, *Phys. Rev. A* **67** (2003) 032304.

[12] V. Kendon and B. Tregenna, *Decoherence is useful in quantum walks*, *Phys. Rev. A* **67** (2003) 042315.

[13] V. Kendon and B. Tregenna, *Decoherence in a quantum walk on the line*, in Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Quantum Communication, Measurement and Computing, eds. J. H. Shapiro and O. Hirota (Rinton Press, Princeton, NJ, 2003).

[14] V. Kendon and B. Tregenna, *Decoherence in discrete quantum walks*, in Quantum Decoherence and Entropy in Complex Systems, ed. H.-T. Elze (Springer, Berlin, 2003).

[15] D. Shapira, O. Biham, A. J. Bracken and M. Hackett, *One dimensional quantum walk with unitary noise*, *Phys. Rev. A* **68** (2003) 062315.